



**Department of Energy**  
Bonneville Power Administration  
P.O. Box 3621  
Portland, Oregon 97208-3621

Official File Copy

ENVIRONMENT, FISH AND WILDLIFE

September 5, 1997

In reply refer to: ECN-4

To: People Interested in the Northwest Regional Power Facility Project.

**ACTION:** BPA is announcing the public availability of a Supplement Analysis for the Northwest Regional Power Facility Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

**BACKGROUND:** BPA released the FEIS for the Northwest Regional Power Facility to the public in June 1996. Since that time the developer has proposed that the project may be built in phases. As a result, several changes in the project are proposed.

**SUPPLEMENT ANALYSIS:** A Supplement Analysis has been prepared to determine whether BPA should supplement the FEIS, a new FEIS should be prepared, or whether further NEPA documentation is required. BPA has found that none of these actions need to be taken.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** If you have further questions or would like a copy of the Supplement Analysis, please call me at the following toll-free number: 1-800-662-6963 or direct at 503-230-3297.

Sincerely,

*LSI: Nancy Wittpenn*

Nancy A. Wittpenn  
Environmental Specialist

Enclosure

Nwittpenn:can:3900:09/08/97: (w:ecn\ecn97\eq-13\crest\suplet.doc)

United States Government

Department of Energy  
Bonneville Power Administration

# memorandum

DATE: September 4, 1997

REPLY TO  
ATTN OF: ECN

SUBJECT: Supplement Analysis for the Northwest Regional Power Facility FEIS


TO: Thomas McKinney - EC

Attached please find the Supplement Analysis for the Northwest Regional Power Facility FEIS. Please review and indicate your concurrence with the findings by signing below. Upon concurrence, the Supplement Analysis will be made available to the public.

  
Nancy Wittpenn  
Environmental Specialist

9/4/97  
Date

Concurrence:

  
Thomas McKinney  
NEPA Compliance Officer

9/4/97  
Date

cc: (w/attachment)

A. DeClerk - TOP

D. Riehl - TNE

B. Underwood - LN

Official File - ECN (EQ-14-5) Crest

NAWittpenn:naw:3297:9/4/97 (ECN-Hsupmem.doc)

# **Supplement Analysis to Determine Whether Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is Necessary for the Northwest Regional Power Facility (NRPF)**

## **1.0 Introduction**

On January 18, 1994, KVA Resources, Inc., and Central & Southwest Energy, Inc. (CSW), predecessors to the present developer Northwest Power Company, L.L.C. (NPC), whose members are KVA Power Company, L.L.C., came to BPA with a good faith request for firm transmission service to integrate the 838 megawatt (MW) output of the proposed NRPF into the Federal Columbia River Transmission System. Because the project is located in the State of Washington, BPA and the State of Washington, through the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC), agreed to conduct a joint National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)/State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process to study the environmental impacts of the proposal. BPA and EFSEC began an environmental study of the proposed project in April 1994, conducted EIS scoping meetings in May 1994, issued a Draft EIS in October 1995, and BPA distributed a Final EIS in June 1996. A Notice of Availability for the Final EIS was published in the Federal Register on July 5, 1996. EFSEC issued their Final EIS in May 1996 and a Site Certification Agreement on September 19, 1996. BPA will issue a Record of Decision (ROD) after the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) completes a site-specific analysis of the pipeline needed to supply the proposed facility with natural gas.

On December 16, 1996, NPC came to BPA with another good faith request for the option of phasing the project. Since the time of the original request and certification of the site by the State of Washington, commercial conditions in the ongoing deregulated electrical industry and market have changed. Conditions may dictate that the project be brought on line in 400-450 MW blocks. This new request reflects changes to the original proposal.

In accordance with the procedural requirements of NEPA, BPA shall prepare a supplemental EIS if there are substantial changes to the proposal or significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns. Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. §1021.314(c), this Supplement Analysis has been prepared to determine if a supplemental EIS is required for the proposed phasing of the project.

## **2.0 Description of the Original Project (same as in the Final EIS)**

The NRPF is located in Eastern Washington, approximately 60 miles (96 kilometers) west of the City of Spokane in Lincoln County and roughly 0.4 miles (0.6 kilometers) east of Creston. The site covers approximately 1,200 acres (486 hectare ), of which approximately 75 acres will be affected by the construction of the project. Project components include: the main equipment building, a 500-kV switch yard, a storm water retention pond, evaporation ponds (approximately 30 acre (12 hectare) total surface area, approximately 3 feet (0.9 meters) deep), and a gas metering station. The proposed plant

would use air-cooled condensers. The facility would treat and evaporate all process wastewater, resulting in zero discharge to surface water.

Water would be supplied to the site through a 4-6 inch (15 centimeter) pipeline connected to the town of Creston's water supply. The NRPF would require approximately 70 gallons per minute (gpm) with short intervals of up to 200 gallons per minute for use in boiler makeup, cooling general process application, and as a domestic water supply.

Fuel for the project, natural gas, is proposed to be supplied to the NRPF by a buried, 20-inch (51 centimeter) lateral pipeline from the Pacific Gas Transmission Company's (PGT) main transmission line east of Spokane. The pipeline may be owned and operated by PGT. The pipeline route would be approximately 60 miles (96 kilometers). It would operate at a minimum of 450 psig (3.1 Mpa-g). The environmental impacts of this lateral gas pipeline will be evaluated in a separate environmental review process, managed by FERC with BPA as a cooperating agency.

The generation facility would connect to and use BPA's transmission lines to transmit the generated electricity to purchasers of the power. Two existing single-circuit 115-kilovolt (kV) transmission lines will be removed and replaced with two new lines (a double-circuit 115-kV and a single-circuit 500-kV line) on the existing right-of-way (ROW) between Bell Substation in Spokane and Grand Coulee Switchyard in Grand Coulee. About 3.5 miles (5.6 kilometers) of new ROW would be needed near Grand Coulee for construction of one of the lines. A series compensation station would be built on the Grand Coulee-Hanford transmission line.

### **3.0 Description of the Project in the Event it is Phased**

This modification would bring the Project on line in two phases. Phase I (nominal 400-450 MW of the original nominal 838 MW) would consist of a generation facility using the same basic components described above. These facilities would connect to and use BPA's three existing 230-kV transmission lines in the Grand Coulee-Bell ROW. To connect to the existing 230-kV lines, the new switching station would operate at 230 kV instead of 500-kV. The station would be smaller in size and positioned in the existing ROW directly below the existing 230-kV lines between structures 30/1 and 30/2 of the existing Grand Coulee-Bell #1, 3 and 5 lines. Four new deadend structures would be needed and placed within the existing ROW on either side of the new station. Two of the structures would replace existing structures. A new 230 kV transmission line would connect the generation facility to the switching station. The line would be about 305

Phase II (the remaining nominal 400-450 MW) would include constructing the remaining parts of the original proposal, at a later time. The date of implementation would be dependent on future market conditions and commercial decisions.

## **4.0 Phase I Environmental Considerations**

### **4.1 Generation and Associated Facilities**

Phasing the project would mean that the impacts to earth, climate, air quality, water quality, plants and animals, environmental health and public safety, land and shoreline use, recreation, visual and aesthetic resources, historic and cultural resources, transportation, and socioeconomics, as described under *NRPF Site* in Section 3.1 and 3.2 of the Draft EIS and associated corrections and modifications in the Final EIS, would be spread over time. The impacts of Phase I would occur when the initial phase of the project is constructed and operated, and the impacts of Phase II would occur if and when it is proposed. Phasing the project should have no additional environmental effects than those already described in the existing environmental documentation.

### **4.2 Transmission Facilities**

Since BPA would not be removing and replacing transmission lines or building a new series compensation station for Phase I, the earth, climate, air quality, water quality, plants and animals, environmental health and public safety, land and shoreline use, recreation, visual and aesthetic resources, historic and cultural resources, transportation, and socioeconomic impacts associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of these facilities, as described under *NRPF Site* and *Transmission Facilities* in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the Draft EIS and associated corrections and modifications in the Final EIS, would not occur.

#### **4.2.1 New Switching Station**

The new switching station would be approximately half the size and located approximately 200 feet to the south of the originally proposed switching station. The affected environment, as described under *NRPF Site* and *Transmission Facilities* in Section 3.1 and 3.2 of the Draft EIS and associated corrections and modifications in the Final EIS, would remain the same. In addition, the impacts resulting from the smaller size and location of the new switching station for earth, climate, air quality, water quality, plants and animals, environmental health and public safety (see Section 4.2.1.1 below for a change in electric and magnetic fields), land and shoreline use, recreation, visual and aesthetic resources, historic and cultural resources, transportation, and socioeconomics would be less or remain the same as those already discussed in the sections noted above.

Integrating the facility into the existing 230-kV lines would alter the electric loading on these lines. The magnetic field surrounding these lines may increase or decrease, depending on the changing load conditions. If the load increases the magnetic fields surrounding the lines may also increase in some areas. For a full discussion of electric

and magnetic fields, refer to *Transmission Facilities* in Section 3.1 and 3.2 of the Draft EIS and associated corrections and modifications in the Final EIS.

#### **4.2.2 New Deadend Structures**

The new deadend structures would be placed in the existing ROW between structures 29/5 and 30/2. The affected environment, as described under *Transmission Facilities* in Section 3.1 and 3.2 of the Draft EIS and associated corrections and modifications in the Final EIS, would remain the same. In addition, the type and level of impacts due to placing four new deadend structures between structures 29/5 and 30/2 with regard to earth, climate, air quality, water quality, plants and animals, environmental health and public safety, land and shoreline use, recreation, visual and aesthetic resources, historic and cultural resources, transportation, and socioeconomic resources, would be substantially the same as those already discussed in the sections noted above.

#### **4.2.3 New Transmission Line**

The new transmission line would be located almost entirely within the boundaries of the originally proposed project site. One structure would be placed just outside the boundary of the project site closer to the new switching station. The affected environment, as described under *NRPF Site* and *Transmission Facilities* in Section 3.1 and 3.2 of the Draft EIS and associated corrections and modifications in the Final EIS, would remain the same. In addition, building a new transmission line would not create any new or additional impacts for earth, climate, air quality, water quality, animals, environmental health and public safety, land and shoreline use, recreation, visual and aesthetic resources, historic and cultural resources, transportation, and socioeconomics other than those already described in the sections mentioned above.

### **5.0 Recommended Mitigation**

- BPA would position and locate the new switching station, deadend towers, and transmission line outside and away from wetlands.
- BPA would use erosion control measures to prevent the migration of sediment into wetlands.

### **6.0 Environmental Considerations of Phase II**

Phase II (the remaining 400-450 MW) would include constructing the remaining parts of the original proposal as detailed in the Final EIS. Environmental impacts are described under *NRPF Site* and *Transmission Facilities* in Section 3.1 and 3.2 of the Draft EIS and associated corrections and modifications in the Final EIS.

## **7.0 Summary**

The modification of phasing construction of the new facilities does not substantially change the original proposal or add significantly new circumstances relevant to environmental concerns.

For Phase I, there would not be any new or additional impacts for earth, climate, air quality, water supply, water quality, plants and animals, energy and natural resources, environmental health and public safety, land and shoreline use, recreation, visual and aesthetic resources, historic and cultural resources, transportation, public service and utilities, and socioeconomics resources other than those already described in Section 3.1 and 3.2 of the Draft EIS and associated corrections and modifications in the Final EIS.

If Phase II is implemented as described in the Final EIS, impacts are not expected to be different than those previously described in Section 3.1 and 3.2 of the Draft EIS and associated corrections and modifications in the Final EIS.

Because of these reasons, preparation of a supplemental EIS is not required.